

From: Kmet, Peter
Sent: Friday, August 11, 2006 2:50 PM
To: Bradley, Dave (ECY); McCormack, Craig
Subject: Verbal Comments from Kris Hendrickson

Kris Hendrickson called with some specific comments which I've documented below:

708(8)(d)(ii)(B) [dioxins/furans]

Step (I): Should make it clear that we are only requiring analysis for dioxin and furan congeners, not dioxin like PCBs (since they are in the same table).

Step (II): Concerned that there is no description of how non-detects are handled.

708(8)(e)(ii)(B) [cPAHs]

Step (I): Should make it clearer if we are asking for all cPAHs to be analyzed or just the minimum 7 required.

Step (II): Similar issue with handling of non-detects.

708(8)(f)(ii)(B) [PCBs]

Step (II): Similar issue with handling of non-detects.

(f)(iii) Would like more specific direction on how to handle non dioxin-like PCBs.

Table 708-2

Title is incorrect.

She also noted that Landau has always run the calculations for dioxins and cPAHs the way it's proposed (using 10-6 risk), and as such didn't see a big impact on their projects. This may not be the case for other consultants, some of which she had heard are using 10-5 risk.

Pete Kmet, P.E.
Dept. of Ecology--Toxics Cleanup Program
PO Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600
(360) 407-7199
pkme461@ecy.wa.gov